

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION**

ABDUL AYAT MOHAMMED BEY, )  
a/k/a Ronald B. Britt-Bey, )  
                                  )  
                                  )  
Plaintiff, )  
                                  )  
                                  )  
v. )                              No. 4:17-cv-965-PLC  
                                  )  
                                  )  
FRANCIS SLAY, et al., )  
                                  )  
                                  )  
Defendants. )

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court upon review of the file. Plaintiff, who is a very frequent *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* litigator in this Court, commenced this civil action on March 14, 2017, and filed a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. On March 20, 2017, the Court granted plaintiff's motion and conducted initial review, and noted numerous defects. For example, plaintiff named eight defendants (the Mayor of the City of Saint Louis, five police officers, and two United States senators) and asserted numerous unrelated claims against them, and the complaint failed to comply with Rules 8 and 10 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court gave plaintiff an opportunity to submit an amended complaint, providing him with specific instructions regarding how to properly compose it. The Court also cautioned plaintiff that his failure to timely comply with the Court's order would result in the dismissal of his case without further notice. His response to the Court was due on April 10, 2017.

To date, plaintiff has neither filed an amended complaint nor sought additional time to do so. Plaintiff was given meaningful notice of what was expected, and cautioned that his case would be dismissed if he failed to timely comply. Therefore, this action will be dismissed without prejudice due to plaintiff's failure to prosecute his case and his failure to comply with

this Court's March 20, 2017 order. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); *see also Dudley v. Miles*, 597 F. App'x 392 (8th Cir. 2015) (*per curiam*) (affirming dismissal without prejudice where *pro se* plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint despite being cautioned that dismissal could result from failure to do so); *Fitzwater v. Ray*, 352 F. App'x 125, 126 (8th Cir. 2009) (*per curiam*) (district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing action without prejudice when the *pro se* plaintiffs failed to comply with an order "directing them to file within fourteen days an amended complaint in conformity with Rule 8"); *Brown v. Frey*, 806 F.2d 801, 803-04 (8th Cir. 1986) (a district court has the power to dismiss an action for the plaintiff's failure to comply with any court order).

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that this case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice. A separate order of dismissal will be entered herewith.

**IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED** than an appeal from this dismissal would not be taken in good faith.

Dated this 20th day of April, 2017.



---

E. RICHARD WEBBER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE